

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

RUEL M HAMILTON (1),

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case Number: 3:19-CR-00083-M

**ORDER**

On May 12, 2025, defense counsel filed a “supplemental response to questions” (ECF No. 523) from the hearing held on May 8, 2025. At the hearing, defense counsel raised the possibility of supplemental briefing and the Court responded that it did not require or want supplemental briefing. However, without seeking or obtaining leave of Court, counsel filed a supplemental response anyway.

The Court ruled at the conclusion of the hearing on the matters that are the subject of the supplement, so there is no reason for it to have been filed, and if permission was sought, it would have been denied. To the extent the supplement is intended as a motion for rehearing, that request is denied.

The Clerk of Court is directed to **STRIKE** ECF No. 523.

**SO ORDERED.**

May 13, 2025.

  
BARBARA M. G. LYNN  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE